
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Region 1 Mountain Residency
P.O. Box 399
Dumont, CO 80436
303-512-5600



DRAFT

I-70 Frontage FIR Meeting Agenda

Project No. C 0703-378

Construction Sub Account: 18648

425 C Corporate Circle, Trail Ridge Conference Room

Golden, Colorado, 80401

December 1, 2011

9:00 AM

Primary Action Items:

1. Clear Creek requested an extension and will provide comments by Dec 15th.
2. CDOT will provide rock wall information to Clear Creek County (as part of detailed engineering discussion to be scheduled)
3. Provide FOR hard copies to whomever needs them in order to get comments at the FOR meeting
4. Provide survey data to Pete and the county for their use.
5. Need to schedule a hydraulics kick-off meeting
6. John will provide Al a preliminary (30%) hydraulics report in early January
7. Tim Mauck will set up the meeting to develop guard rail options.
8. County and CDOT will discuss and make a team decision on who will be responsible for carrying out the SWMP requirements.
9. Tim requested a list of local agency agreements, commitment letters, and local agency letters

Introductions

- I. Scoping, budgeting and programming
 - a. Overall Project Limits
 - i. Phase I: Doghouse Rail Bridge to Hidden Valley
 1. Twin Tunnels will impact CR314 just west of Hidden Valley
 2. Final Design will transition to stop at the point where Twin Tunnels has use and impacts the Frontage Road.
 - ii. All work should be within CDOT or County ROW for Phase I
 - iii. ROW in the form of easements and acquisition will be required for some Phase II areas – correct cover page to clarify begin and end of phase I
 - iv. Comments from PLT members and others will be due by December 15th
 - b. Budget/Funding
 - i. Phase I: \$6.250 Million (Fully Funded State Funds)
 - ii. Phase II: TBD
 - c. Estimated Cost
 - i. Phase I: \$6.6 million with contingency factors. This cost will come down as plans are finalized for FOR stage for Phase I.
 - ii. Phase II: \$12.7 Million
 - iii. All estimates have contingency included until survey verifies aerial data and plans are further along. Estimates have not been submitted to EEMA for analysis yet.
 - d. Schedule – Phase I
 - i. Design
 1. FIR 12/1/2011
 2. FOR March 2012
 - ii. Construction
 1. April 2012 Advertisement
 2. June 2012 to October 2012 Construction

- 3. Open to traffic in fall of 2012
 - 4. Frontage road may be used as detour spring-fall 2013 and returned to use as frontage road - goal is October 31, 2013.
 - e. Schedule - Phase II Improvements
 - 1. Jan 2012 – Catex Clearance for Phase I & II
 - 2. Explore impacts and issues on Phase II – ROW, etc.
- II. Road Way Design

Craig and MK provided an overview of the information provided to the PLT about construction areas and graphics of proposed cross sections.

 - a. Cross Sections
 - i. The cross section on the top of 03 of 04 will either be a retaining wall or might be a cantilever section (cross section C) which we will have to look at now that we have full survey. Tim asked and Ben confirmed that either way, it will be built to support vehicle traffic.
 - b. Decision Areas
 - c. Greenway Task Force

One takeaway was that the guardrail would be a follow up item with THK and Hugh Osborne to determine what the design detail should be.
- III. Traffic
 - a. Accident Data
 - b. Lighting
 - c. Permanent Striping
 - d. Construction Traffic Control
 - i. Does the CDOT Lane Closure Report?
 - ii. No, Clear Creek follows the standard CDOT projects and would just need to come to a consensus with the interested parties about how the closure would work.
 - e. Traffic Management Organization (TMO) – Does this apply? No.
 - f. Sign Replacement
 - g. Traffic Projections
 - h. Accesses
 - i. Doghouse Bridge
 - ii. Bell Property
 - iii. Business Access for west area
 - iv. Rafting, Bike, Fishing, Ped traffic – Bike Route

Rick Beck: For the accesses on Phase II, where are they and who are they for?
 Craig: They were mapped because they were all the ones we identified in the field.
 Rick: On 9 of 15, what is that begin point?
 Craig: It is the beginning of the bike path immediately east of the doghouse bridge.
- IV. Bridge/Structures
 - a. Rockery Walls – Majors Structures need numbers – Steve will need mile marker limits, heights and types.
 - i. Since Clear Creek does not have mile marker data, Baker will create mile maker numbers to identify roadway points
 - ii. Baker and PB will do the wall design and Steve will review it.
 - iii. Since the County will be the owner, CDOT does not need to assign the structural number. Will Rick want to assign his own structure number?
 - iv. Wall 12 is a wall that is and will remain a CDOT structure so that one will need a CDOT number (which could be the existing number).
 - v. Kevin O'Malley said Rick needs to know about the maintenance and life span of the walls before Clear Creek can agree to accept the number, location and types of walls.
 - vi. Details of the geotechnical information, drainage, erosion anticipation, maintenance warranty for rock walls is important for Clear Creek to know before making decisions.
 - vii. Clear Creek County would be interested in the option for a warranty or at least a 1-year period to see how the structures fare through the first four seasons.
 - b. Cantilever Structures – Major Structures need numbers;
 - c. Doghouse Bridge - Twin Tunnels

V. Materials

- a. Stabilization Plan/Recommendations
 - i. The pavement cores from CR 314 and the spur range in thickness from 2.25" to 7.0". A conservative thickness of 2.25" is used for overlay design calculations.
 - ii. Stabilization Report and Plan – 10/27/2011
 - iii. The Materials Unit recommends that the existing frontage road and spur be overlaid with 3.5" of asphalt Gr SX(75) PG 58-28. The overlay shall be placed in two lifts, a bottom lift of 1.5" and a top lift of 2". Where required, the road will be widened with 4.5" of asphalt on grade, also Gr SX(75) PG 58-28. The widening section shall be constructed in two lifts, a bottom lift of 2.5" and a top lift of 2". The top lift of 2" shall be full-width over both the overlay and widening sections.
 1. Where we are widening we are going to try to do at least a 4 foot section. Are there other
 - iv. Total pavement costs for the detour road are approximately \$500,000. As per the CDOT Pavement Design Manual, no Life Cycle Cost Analysis is required.
- b. Pavement Analysis.
 - i. We did not do a pavement analysis since it is off system. Visual inspection was done and we assigned a conservative structure number. (Rick asked to see this number). It is anticipated that after the detour is completed, CDOT staff committed that they will rehab the frontage road to pre-detour conditions.
- c. Pavement Justification Letter.
 - i. Janet said this is the same thing as the stabilization report, which is already done so she will rename it and submit it to Ben.
- d. Preliminary Soil Survey - completed in October 2011
 - i. Cores for Contaminates Testing – Mine Tailings or Rock
 1. If we need to do excavation, we should analyze it so that we know if there is any contamination that would require any kind of special disposal of the material.
 2. We are only anticipating excavation of a couple inches plus a few spot locations for drainage that we might excavate more material.
 3. CDOT is only concerned about excavated material if it will a) remain exposed or b) removed from the site. If it is replaced and paved over, it won't matter.
 - ii. Cores still available.
- e. Alternative Pavement Design
 - i. No Life Cycle required. HMA will be the selected pavement.
- f. Timeline for FOR Plans
 - i. Goal is for FOR in March

VI. Hydraulics

- a. Hydrology – 2 Year and 100 year Flood Plain, Ordinary High water mark
 - i. Updated information was received from the twin tunnels team.
- b. LOMA - Any required reports, quick brief on hydraulics meeting from Samer or AI?
 - i. AI, John and Josh met to review the data being shared by the Twin Tunnels and Frontage Road teams. They looked at eh rafter pull-out area but since it is a zone A in a step section, there are not restrictive FEMA regulations. John is confirming with Clear Creek to confirm that there are no additional County requirements.
 - ii. AI: Are we talking about replacing any pipes in this area? John: We collected pipe size data and did a visual pipe analysis.
 - iii. If we need to replace pipes, CDOT will need a pipe replacement analysis.
- c. Hydrology (Drainage Report)
- d. Hydraulic Report
 - i. John will provide AI a preliminary report at the end of December

VII. Maintenance Issues

- a. Idaho Springs
 - i. John: We don't do maintenance on that section and won't be affected in terms of access to the water treatment plant
- b. Clear Creek County
 - i. 8' or 10' trail – it appears that we will get a 10' trail when you add the shy zone into the 8' clear.

- ii. Rick made previous comments about pavement section
 - iii. Drop in culvert maintenance
- c. Drainage Issue areas
- d. Guardrail
 - i. New Guardrail
 - ii. Types of Guardrail
- e. Sediment/Snow Removal Issues
 - Concerns about oversize basins and maintenance responsibilities
 - i. Clear Creek County
 - ii. CDOT

VIII. Environmental/Landscape

- a. Public Involvement – PLT/TT and CSS Process
 - i. PLT/TT Meetings
 - 1. December 15th, 2011, 1pm to 4pm in Idaho Springs at City Hall
 - a. We need to have agreement about cross sections
 - ii. Master Communications and Meetings Booklet Update – 12/1/2011
 - iii. CCC, Idaho Springs, CDOT Meeting to finalized buy in and decisions for Phase I
 - iv. PLT/TT endorsement tentatively at Dec 15th, 2011 meeting.
- b. CSS Status (Janet and Jason)
- c. Form 128 – Will follow prelim/final 463 mid-December
- d. Form 463 – Will start after all decisions final, mid-December
- e. Roles and Responsibilities Matrix - Janet
- f. Section 106
 - i. Power plant across from the doghouse bridge has been preliminarily determined that it is not eligible for federal protection status.
- g. Section 4(f) – Improvements to Bike Path, separate path
 - i. The Frontage Road greenway will take into account impacts on recreational resources but since it is not federally funded it does not trigger a 4(f) review
- h. Section 6(f) - does not apply
- i. Historic, Archaeology, Paleontology, Floodplains
 - Dave Pierce said that he looked at the remnant pieces of the mine infrastructure and it looks like the wall in the area will not impact that historic feature and that there will still be room to provide a trail on the private land around there.
- j. Wetlands
 - Two small wetlands have been identified, but we feel like we can probably avoid them
 - Rebecca Pierce would also want us to avoid temporary impacts since they are so hard to re-establish.
 - i. Impacts and Mitigation
 - ii. Impacts on Phase I
 - iii. Less than ½ Acre on Phase II
 - iv. Do we need to cover impacts for Phase II for Cat Ex.
- k. Division of Wildlife (SB 40)
- l. T & E Species
- m. Hazardous Waste and Materials
 - i. ESA I Study by Pinyon through David Singer and Marc Morton
- n. Noise Analysis – likely not merited since the designs do not change the traffic volumes
- o. Air Quality - likely not merited since the designs do not change the traffic volumes
- p. 401 Certification
- q. 402 Permit
- r. 404 Permit - ACOE
- s. Permanent Best Management Practices (BMPs)
- t. Water Quality - SCAP meeting was help.
- u. SWEEP - Last meeting was yesterday
- v. ALIVE
- w. CDPHE Permit, Erosion Control, Landscaping & Seeding, Wildflowers, Noxious Weeds
- x. SWMP – will be in the FOR plans

Who will maintain the SWMP? County and CDOT will discuss and make a team decision on who will be responsible for carrying out the SWMP requirements. CDOT typically maintains these areas until they are returned to 70% of the vegetative state.

- i. Inspection
 - ii. Plan
 - y. Water Monitoring Wells
- IX. Right of Way and Utilities
 - The estimate of \$1.3M to install the utilities as part of this project is being considered by Idaho Springs.
 - ohn asked if we could possibly just install the elements needed in the Phase I section.
 - a. Xcel and Qwest
 - i. Relocation of Utility Lines Update – Dave has been out sick so there is not an update but now that we have the new survey we will need to review.
 - b. ROW Update
 - i. Impacts Phase I - none
 - ii. Impacts Phase II – additional ROW survey will be necessary but the basic impacts are known and will be shared with Ben so he can provide them to the impacted property owners.
 - 1. Western Decision Area
 - 2. Gravel Road Decision Area
 - 3. Easter Decision Area - Possible Twin Tunnels Impacts Dec 2012
 - a. Needs impact analysis by EA. Should have by Jan 2012
 - c. Woolpert Survey Update
 - i. Survey Complete and Out to teams.
 - ii. <http://www.coloradodot.info/projects/i70twintunnels/cmgc> under 2011 Woolpert Survey but also available via FTP site with Baker.
 - d. Utility Clearance
 - i. Xcel
 - ii. Qwest
- X. Agreements, Justifications, and Approvals
 - a. ADA
 - b. Bicycle and pedestrian issues – Janet working on a meeting??
 - c. Safety Review
 - d. Resurfacing project letter
 - e. Hydraulic Design
 - i. Erosion control
 - f. Storm water quality management
 - g. Special Provisions – will be part of the specifications
 - h. Local agency Agreements – Only if Town/County Funds involved.
 - i. We will need the 1041 process for Idaho Springs and Clear Creek County
 - ii. There is a fee associated with submitting the application
 - iii. CDOT is pursuing the ability to submit a single 1041 for both entities. Clear Creek is okay with that but Bob Leffler the CCC attorney may have an opinion about how it could be done legally.
 - iv. The joint planning agreement is corridor wide but does not apply to these two specific projects.
- XI. General
 - a. 859 – Timeline for construction
 - b. OJT/ DBE – handled internally and may not be necessary since it is state funded.